



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XXXIII, 2.

WHOLE NO. 130.

---

## I.—THE SCEPTICAL ASSAULT ON THE ROMAN TRADITION CONCERNING THE DRAMATIC SATURA.

For more than twenty years Professors F. Leo and G. L. Hendrickson have sought to discredit the Roman tradition which declares that, prior to the time of wide and continuous influence of the Greeks upon the Roman mind and on Latin literature, there had been in Italy and in Rome native or quasi-native forms of the drama, among them the *Versus Fescennini* and the dramatic *Satura*.<sup>1</sup> No one, so far as I know, has, in print,

<sup>1</sup>For Leo's papers see *Hermes* 24 (1889) .67-84, *Varro und die Satire*; *Hermes* 39 (1904) .63-77, *Livius und Horaz über die Vorgeschichte des Römischen Dramas*. These had been preceded in Germany by a brief discussion by O. Jahn; *Hermes* 2 (1867) .225-226. Up to 1894 the sceptics had attracted little attention in Germany, and none in America. Hendrickson (*A. J. P.* XV 5, note 2) cited only Kiessling (in his edition of Horace's *Sermones*, 1886, *Einleitung* VII, his notes on *Serm.* I. 4. 1-6, and later his notes on *Epistles* 2. 1. 139-156), and B. Grubel, *De Satirae Romanae Origine et Progressu* (a Program of Posen, 1883), as followers of Jahn prior to Leo's first paper in 1889.

For Hendrickson's papers see *A. J. P.* XV (1894). 1-30, *The Dramatic Satira and the Old Comedy at Rome*; *A. J. P.* XIX (1898). 285-311, *A Pre-Varronian Chapter of Roman Literary History*; *Classical Philology* 6 (1911). 129-143, *Satura—The Genesis of a Literary Form*; *Cl. Phil.* 6, 334-343, *The Provenance of Jerome's Catalogue of Varro's Works*.

For a time Professor Hendrickson's first two papers attracted some attention in this country: see papers by E. M. Pease, *The Satirical Element in Ennius*, *P. A. P. A.* 27 (1896). xlviii-1; Professor Pease again, the article *Satira*, in *Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities* (1897), 1413-1416; H. M. Hopkins, *Dramatic Satira in Relation to Book Satira*, *P. A. P. A.* 31 (1900). 1-11; B. L. Gildersleeve, the article *Satire*, in the *Universal Cyclopaedia and Atlas* (1901); J. Elmore, *Livy's Account of the Dra-*

subjected their arguments to searching and detailed criticism. That criticism it is the purpose of the present paper to supply, so far as the limits of space allow. The sceptics have had so long an inning, their arguments are so intricate and involve so many details, they have said so many things that, in my opinion, are open to question, that I can do no more now than consider several of their more important utterances; I must perforce follow an eclectic method, picking out the more serious matters, and putting off to another paper (perhaps to other papers) much that I should like to say. I regret that the paper will seem to be devoted so largely to destructive criticism. It must be remembered, however, that the destructive criticism in this matter of the dra-

---

matic Satura, P. A. P. A. 34 (1903). lxxvii-lxxviii. None of these papers handled the subject at length. Nor was Professor Hendrickson always named. American editors of works dealing directly or indirectly with Roman satire or Roman comedy have handled the matter somewhat gingerly, returning, on the whole, a verdict of not proven: see e. g. H. R. Fairclough, *Terence, Andria* (1901), p. ix; H. C. Elmer, *Terence, Phormio* (1895), xiv, note; H. L. Wilson, *Juvenal* (1903), vi, n. 5; J. C. Rolfe, *Horace, Satires and Epistles* (1901), xvi, with note 2. In *Cl. Phil.* 7, 59-65, J. W. D. Ingersoll, *Satire: its Early Name*, supports Hendrickson's paper in *Cl. Phil.* 6, 129-143.

In Germany, prior to Hendrickson's first paper, Julius Orendi, *M. Terentius Varro, die Quelle zu Livius vii, 2* (a Bistritz program of 1891), had argued that Valerius Maximus is not, as so many scholars have thought, a mere paraphrase of Livy 7, 2. I had myself, before I knew of Orendi's paper, reached the same conclusion; there are some marked differences between the two passages.

For other German discussions see e. g. Schanz, *Römische Literaturgeschichte*<sup>2</sup>, §§ 9, 55; Schanz<sup>3</sup> (1907), § 9, pp. 21-23; A. Dieterich, *Pulcinella* (1897), 75-78; Fr. Marx, *Lucilius* (1904), I, IX-XVII; E. Norden, in Gercke and Norden's *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* (1910), 2, 454-455; Vahlen, *Ennius*<sup>2</sup> (1903), CCXIV. Vahlen agrees, in a brief obiter dictum, with the sceptics; Marx is a thorough-going sceptic; Dieterich and Norden stand by the tradition. F. Plessis, *La Poésie Latine* (1909), 104-106, de Mirmont, *Études sur l'ancienne Poésie Latine* (1903), 353, and Duff, *A Literary History of Rome* (1909), 73, 80-83 are also true to the tradition (though there is nothing in Duff to show that he had examined the views of the sceptics).

Since the present paper was begun, Mr. R. H. Webb, in *Cl. Phil.* 7, 177-189, *On the Origin of Roman Satire*, has come to the defense of the tradition.

I have myself thrice already handled our subject, very briefly: see A. J. P. XXIX (1908), 468-470, in a review of Marx's *Lucilius*; P. A. P. A. 40 (1910), lii-lvi, *The Dramatic Satura among the Romans*; *Cl. Phil.* 7 (1912), 131, in a review of Kiessling-Heinze<sup>4</sup>, *Horace, Satiren*.

For the method used in referring to these papers see below, end of note 3 to page 127.

matic satira comes really from those who are seeking to discredit the Roman tradition, not from the champions of that tradition.

The problem involved in the question of the existence or non-existence of the dramatic satira among the Romans is one of prime importance to the student of Latin literature, especially to one who would preserve for the Romans credit for some measure of originality (A. J. P. XXIX 469); it deserves, therefore, the most careful consideration.<sup>1</sup>

I cling firmly to the principle, sufficiently obvious, yet repeatedly disregarded, that, though the ancients constantly made mistakes, not merely in the domain of speculation about facts and their causes, but even in the realm of fact itself, yet, after all, since they saw matters at closer range than we can see them, and, in the field of fact, with a larger and surer understanding than even the best modern scholar can ever hope to win, it follows that, in certain fields at least—in the realm of the objective, of fact—they are more likely to be right than modern scholars are. In such matters, then, I incline to stand by the ancient tradition, and to demand of the sceptic evidence thoroughly convincing.<sup>2</sup>

From this principle certain corollaries flow. First, we must in each disputed case determine exactly what the ancient tradition is. Secondly, having determined what the tradition really is, we are bound to ask whether it is in itself inherently probable or palpably absurd, whether what we know from other sources, independently of the tradition, about the people involved—Greeks or Romans—confirms the tradition or refutes it. Accordingly, a complete discussion of the dramatic satira among the Romans involves an examination of passages in Vergil, Horace, Livy, Valerius Maximus, Diomedes, Donatus, Euanthius, Aristotle, and in the treatises *περὶ κωμωδίας* prefixed to the scholia on Aristophanes.<sup>3</sup> Right procedure demands that we should at first

<sup>1</sup> In A. J. P. XXIX 469-470 I have pointed out that, since dramatic Fescennines and dramatic satira rest on essentially the same evidence, the rejection of one involves the rejection of the other. This point Schanz<sup>3</sup> § 9, pp. 21-22, did not see: see below, pages 146-148.

<sup>2</sup> Compare my protest in A. J. P. XXXII 9 against the arbitrary treatment meted out by scholars to Gellius.

<sup>3</sup> See Vergil, *Georgics* 2, 380-389; Livy 7, 2; Horace *Epp.* 2, 1, 139-156; Valerius Maximus 2, 4, 4; Diomedes, in Keil's *Grammatici Latini* 1, 482-492,

keep the Latin passages apart from the Greek, and that we should study them first by themselves; further, each individual Latin passage should be isolated, sterilized, so to say, kept clear of all contamination by other Latin passages, as if it alone supplied our entire store of information concerning real or supposed forms of the early Roman drama. What did Horace really say? what did Livy say? what views did Aristotle set forth? Are the Latin passages reducible to one or are they more or less independent one of another? To say that there may be much surface resemblance with wide fundamental divergence is a platitude; yet obvious as this fact is, it has been forgotten by our sceptics concerning the dramatic *satura*.<sup>1</sup> Is the view set forth by the Latin passages so far identical with that outlined by Aristotle and (or) other Greek sources that we must assume dependence of the Latin versions on the Greek? or are there divergences which prove the Latin narratives to be independent of the Greek? Having done all this, we must ask whether in our knowledge of the Roman character, temperament, mental equipment, or history we find suggestion or evidence confirmatory of the tradition about the dramatic *satura*, or whether it is rather true that such knowledge requires us to dismiss the narratives under review. These things the sceptics have not done.<sup>2</sup>

Since I have already (P. A. P. A. 40, lii-lvi) given an indication of the results of the application of such method, the present

---

especially 485-486; Aristotle, *Poetics*, chapters IV-V, 1448-1449, *Nicom. Eth.* 4, 14.

The treatises *περὶ κωμῳδίας* may be conveniently found in the Teubner text of Aristophanes, by Bergk, I, XXIX-XLVII, and in G. Kaibel, *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Berlin, 1899), I, 3-53. Kaibel also gives, pages 53-71, the pertinent excerpts from Diomedes, Euanthius, and Donatus. For Euanthius and Donatus see also P. Wessner, *Donati Commentum Terenti*, I, 13-31.

I am obliged, by lack of space, to assume that the reader will have the text of the foregoing passages at all times at hand; if this paper is to be kept within bounds, quotations must be used sparingly.

Again, to save space, I shall cite or quote the papers referred to above, p. 125, n. 1, in the briefest possible way, giving the author's name, and the page number, or, if the author has several papers within our field, volume and page number. I trust the inconvenience caused by this space-saving plan will not be great.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my remarks in P. A. P. A. 40, lii-liii. Leo 39. 69-72, did indeed apply the method outlined above to Livy and Horace, but he did not go far enough; he was, further, blinded again by his desire to prove a specific point.

<sup>2</sup> See P. A. P. A. 40, lv-lvi.

paper will be devoted to a review of some of the sceptical articles. In *Hermes* 2. 225-226 O. Jahn declared that Livy 7. 2 rested on the combinations of some grammarian,<sup>1</sup> because (1) the development of comedy there given is too clean cut to be the reflex of fact, (2) the narrative is markedly aetiological in character, (a) in the account of the *canticum* (§§ 9-10), (b) in what is said of the privileged position of the *actores fabularum Atellanarum* (§§ 11-12). Of these points (1) is a purely subjective assertion; to others Livy's narrative has seemed less orderly. (2) involves a curious lack of logic. In Livy, §§ 9-10, 11-12, two things are involved: (a) facts, real or alleged, (b) explanations of those facts. We thus come at once to the distinction drawn above, page 127. Absolute foolishness in connection with (b) is no proof of error in (a). Jahn himself describes the phenomena as "zwei noch in späterer Zeit festgehaltene, auffallende Gebräuche". In the *mimi* and the *pantomimi* we have precisely that division of functions which Livy asserts with respect to the delivery of the *cantica* in the time of Livius Andronicus.<sup>2</sup> Pliny Epp. 9.34 attests, for oratory, a similar division. Since he is himself a bad reader, one of his freedmen is to 'recite' for him. *Ipse nescio*, he continues, *quid illo legente interim faciam, sedeam defixus mutus et similis otioso*, an, *ut quidam, quae pronuntiabit murmure oculis manu prosequar. Sed puto me non minus male saltare quam legere.*

Livy, continues Jahn, differentiates sharply the native *iuventus* with their "freies Spiel" and the professional actors (foreigners, he calls them), with their artistic drama,<sup>3</sup> "wobei die Parallele mit dem griechischen Satyrdrama, wiewohl sie nicht ausgesprochen

<sup>1</sup> Jahn thought of Varro, *De Originibus Scenicis*. A strange way to prove a narrative false, this way of tracing it to the *doctissimus Romanorum*! The sceptics have made Varro out both knave and fool.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Friedländer in Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsg.* 3. 554 (1885), Sitteng<sup>6</sup>, 2. 447-448 (the latest edition available to me). In the latter place he remarks that the separation of singing and gesticulation described by Livy facilitated the resolution of the drama into its elements (its reversion to type, we might say).

<sup>3</sup> Livy (§ 7) clearly enough assigns the *saturae* to *vernaculi artifices*. Foreigners he mentions in terms but once; they were the imported Tuscan *ludiones* (§ 4). That these were professionals I have urged in *P. A. P. A.* 40. liv, but they had nothing to do with the artistic drama. See also below, p. 136, n. 4. Livius Andronicus, pioneer in the really artistic drama, was of course foreigner also; but that Livy does not say. Jahn was sadly confused.

wird, unverkennbar ist".<sup>1</sup> The "formlose *satura*"<sup>2</sup> (*satura*, he thinks, is conceived of by Livy as a peculiarly Roman form of the drama) the *iuventus* kept to themselves,<sup>3</sup> even after Andronicus began *argumento fabulam serere*, exactly as "in Attika der ausgebildeten Tragödie gegenüber das οὐδὲν πρὸς Διόνυσον das Satyr-drama als Begleiter der Tragödie hervorrief".

The two preceding paragraphs, with the footnotes, have made it clear, I hope, that Jahn was largely, if not wholly wrong. Yet his paper deserves the attention bestowed upon it here, because in three important matters it has been and is still 'massgebend' for the sceptics. (1) Others—e. g. Leo 24. 77, Hendrickson 15. 3—have held that the account in Livy was too good to be true; (2) Leo, *ibid.*, Hendrickson 15. 1-3, Schanz<sup>2</sup>, § 9, Schanz<sup>3</sup>, § 9, p. 21, all emphasize the aetiological element in Livy: none of them notes the point made by me above in this connection, page 129; (3) Keissling and Leo (see below, note 1) and Hendrickson 15. 4, 10-19, 29-30 made the *saturae* an invention of some grammarian, as an assumed analogue to something in the actual development of the Greek drama.<sup>4</sup>

Next comes F. Leo's paper, Varro und die Satire, Hermes 24 (1889). 67-84. Most fully condensed it runs thus: (1) All Roman accounts of the *satura* (of comedy and satire<sup>5</sup>) go back to one

<sup>1</sup> This suggestion Kiessling<sup>1</sup>, VII (see below, note 4), and Leo 24. 77, adopted. They, with Jahn, failed to note that Livy was talking only of comedy, that the satyrdrama belonged with tragedy. See Hendrickson's convincing refutation of their arguments, 15. 7-9. In 39. 67, n. 1 Leo withdrew the suggestion, yielding to Hendrickson.

<sup>2</sup> Livy (§ 7) in fact makes the *saturae* a considerable improvement in form over the Fescennines. See Weissenborn-Müller ad loc., and Hendrickson 15. 12-13 (the latter, however, goes too far: see below, page 145).

<sup>3</sup> What the *iuventus* kept for themselves was the (revised) Fescennines: compare Livy § 11 with § 5, and see Hendrickson again, 15. 7-9.

<sup>4</sup> Kiessling, the next sceptic of importance (1886), need not detain us long; see above, note 1. In accordance with the plan of his book he made his statements in dogmatic fashion, without evidence or citation of authorities. No doubt, however, he had Jahn's article in mind. In the third Auflage of his edition of the Satires of Horace, prepared by R. Heinze (1906), there was no real change, except that Accius rather than Varro was suggested as the source of Livy's narrative: here one sees the influence of Hendrickson 19. In the fourth Auflage, also by Heinze (1910), Accius's name is withdrawn, as is also the suggestion that the *saturae* were an analogue to the Satyrdrama: see Cl. Phil. 7. 131.

<sup>5</sup> Leo does not explain why he begins an article on Varro und die Satire by talking of comedy; throughout he talks more of satire than of comedy. For

source, Varro;<sup>1</sup> (2) Varro derived his account, not from fact, but from Greek accounts of Greek comedy.<sup>1</sup> A fuller analysis, which will, I hope, be of service, follows.

(1) To Roman comedy *ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν* was unknown;<sup>2</sup> the *Leges XII Tabularum*, police vengeance, and the *actio iniuriarum* all alike threatened the scoffer (67). (2) Lucilius first shook off these shackles (68). (3) The etymologies of *satura* given by Diomedes go back through Suetonius to Varro. So O. Jahn, Rh. Mus. 9. 629.<sup>3</sup> The

the explanation see Horace Serm. 1. 4. 45-65, noting especially that *comoedia* is the subject of discourse throughout, that the word is to be supplied as grammatical subject in 63, and that in 65 it is replaced by *genus hoc scribendi* (plainly 'satire': cf., in S. 1. 4, *scripta mea*, 22-23, *genus hoc*, 24, *his*, 56, in S. 1. 10, *haec*, 37, *hoc*, 46. On Horace's practice in thus designating his writings in *Sermones* I Hendrickson, Cl. Phil. 6. 131, rests in part his theory of the late origin of *satura* as a literary term: see below, p. 144, n. 1). Manifestly to Horace comedy and satire were convertible terms: see P. A. P. A. 40. lv (second full paragraph).

<sup>1</sup> Leo's paper is thus an effort to supply the proof for Jahn's unsupported contentions (see above, p. 129).

<sup>2</sup> This opening remark seems at first blush irrelevant. But Leo begins thus because he means to argue that, since to Roman comedy (satire) personal invective was unknown, any account of Roman comedy (satire) which emphasizes the element of personal invective shows at once a non-Roman origin. One who sought a Roman parallel to the *ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν* of Old Comedy must find it, he urges, not in Roman comedy, but in Lucilius, as Horace did, in S. 1. 4. 1-6 (but see below, pages 141-144). Leo is paving the way for the point he brings out later, for which see the analysis of his paper, under 3, h, β (page 133). This argument is so important to his whole structure that it must be carefully examined.

<sup>3</sup> There is space to consider only a few points in Jahn's paper. To say that because Juvenal is not named by Diomedes his statements go back to ante-Juvenalian times is to strain too hard an argument sorely overworked by all our sceptics, the argument from silence. On the dangers of that argument see e. g. A. J. P. XXVIII 64-65, XXIX 469, and below, page 138. Jahn himself notes that Jerome, a diligent reader of Juvenal, does not mention him in his *Chronica*: the argument from silence per se would prove that Jerome did not know Juvenal at all.

Another reason advanced by Jahn for believing that Suetonius was Diomedes's source is the fact that he is mentioned by Diomedes, 491. 30. He is, but at the very end of a long chapter, 165 lines beyond the close of the discussion of *satura*: when finally named, he is cited for a very different matter, the *membra comoediarum Romanarum*, i. e. the *diverbiū* and the *canticum*. It would be fairer to infer from the specific mention of him here that he was not the source elsewhere in the chapter.



reasons<sup>1</sup> for this view are: (a) Suetonius is named in this chapter; (b) Juvenal is not named: hence the original was written in ante-Juvenalian times; (c) Varro is named several times (488: see p. 69); (d) The four etymologies offered by Diomedes are reducible to two, one Greek, the other Latin: Varro often gives a similar choice between a Latin and a Greek etymology (70); (e) Lucilius is cited: Suetonius never cites Lucilius, Varro sometimes does (70-71);<sup>2</sup> Festus's explanation of *satura* (314, Müller) also probably contained a citation from Lucilius: hence Festus probably goes back through Verrius Flaccus to Varro, as Diomedes goes back through Suetonius to Varro (71); (g) Diomedes's explanations of *satura* as 'medley' fit Ennian satire, not Lucilian or later satire: hence they come from a time remote from his own day, i. e. from Varro (71).

Jahn held, finally, that Borghesi's investigations concerning the period at which Juvenal lived had shown that Suetonius could not have mentioned him. This is surely wrong. Juvenal's published work belongs to 100-130 A. D., Suetonius lived on to 150 or 160: see e. g., for Juvenal, Friedländer, *Juvenal*, 5-15, Wilson, *Juvenal*, xiii, with notes, A. J. P. XIX 193-194, Schanz<sup>3</sup>, § 419, p. 175, Duff, *Juvenal*, x, xv-xvii, Butler, *Post-Augustan Poetry*, 287, 289-290; for Suetonius, see Teuffel, §§ 347, 347. 8, E. Norden, in Gercke and Norden's *Einleitung*, etc., 3. 526, Leo in *Kultur der Gegenwart*, I. VIII. 367, Schuckburgh, *Vita Augusti*, xxviii-xxix. It should be added that Keil, *Gramm. Lat.* I. LIV-LV, and Reifferscheid, *Suetonii Reliquiae*, 4-22, 370-371, make Suetonius the source of Diomedes.

One point more. What of Diomedes's *nunc quidem* (balanced as it is by *olim* in the next sentence: see below, p. 133, n. 1)? Said by Diomedes himself, the words have no special sense discoverable now by us. To suppose that Diomedes quoted them bodily from his source is to make him out rather stupid. Grant, however, that he did quote them: if quoted from Suetonius, as Jahn, Leo, Keil, and Reifferscheid maintain, how—in view of the chronological data supplied above—could the readers of Suetonius have failed to apply them to Juvenal, unnamed though he was? If the words are quoted from Varro, they would most naturally have been interpreted by Varro's readers of Lucilius: thus we get the *ὀνομαστὶ κομῶδεν* in Lucilius, on Varro's authority (see, then, above, page 131, n. 2). In any case the two words, wholly neglected by the septsics, are most important.

It is to be noted that in this paper, published in 1854, Jahn did not mention Livy's account at all. His scepticism was voiced thirteen years later.

<sup>1</sup> Of these (a) and (b) were urged by Jahn; the rest are due to Leo. Jahn had carried Suetonius's narrative back to Varro, but on other grounds.

<sup>2</sup> What of it? In his extant writings Suetonius had little, if any, chance to mention or quote Lucilius; their interests lay too far apart. In his *De Viris Illustribus* Suetonius did not in general go back much of Cicero's time: cf. Reifferscheid, *Suetonii Reliquiae*, 405, 422; Norden, *Kunstprosa*<sup>1</sup>, 387-388.

(h) The objection that Suetonius himself added to earlier accounts the words *archaeae caractere comoediae compositum*,<sup>1</sup> after Horace (71), Leo now meets by two lines of thought: (α) Euanthius uses the same general sources as Diomedes and Donatus employed, but of the special addition of Suetonius ap. Diom. 491. 30 ff.<sup>2</sup> neither Donatus nor Euanthius knows anything (71-72);<sup>3</sup> Euanthius, then, and Donatus did not draw directly on Suetonius. On the Greek side Euanthius is in accord with the treatises *περὶ κωμῳδίας*, for he differentiates types of comedy by their degree of freedom of speech (72). He connects Lucilius's satire with the Old Comedy (72): hence his general conception is akin to Varro's (so Rh. Mus. 38. 327) and the Aristotelian-Peripatetic-Alexandrian, but is independent of Suetonius (73); (β) It was the one-sided emphasis unnaturally laid on the personal element in the Old Attic Comedy that led to the equally one-sided emphasis unnaturally laid on the personal element in Roman satire. It was not inevitable that one should find the essential spirit either of Roman comedy or of Roman satire in the personal element (73-74).<sup>4</sup>

The accounts of Diomedes, Euanthius, Donatus, Horace, Livy, Varro—in reality one account—rest on the Aristotelian-Peripatetic-Alexandrian view of the history of Greek comedy, as seen e. g. in Aristotle's Poetics and Nicomachean Ethics, and in the treatises *περὶ κωμῳδίας*, in which the only criterion by which the types of Greek comedy are distinguished is the degree of sharpness of personal invective.<sup>5</sup> So Leo. The effort here was to bring the

<sup>1</sup> Diomedes begins thus (485): *Satira dicitur carmen apud Romanos nunc quidem maledicum et ad carpenda hominum vitia archaeae comoediae caractere compositum, quale scripserunt Lucilius et Horatius et Persius. Et olim carmen quod ex variis poematibus constabat satira vocabatur, quale scripserunt Pacuvius et Ennius.* Leo, 24. 69, without explanation, brackets *et Horatius et Persius*; Kaibel, *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 1.55, does not nor does he refer in his App. Crit. to Leo.

<sup>2</sup> I. e. the discussion of the *membra comoediae*; see page 131, n. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Put more simply, this means: We do not get in Euanthius and Donatus every detail we find in Diomedes, but we do find in them, as in Diomedes (Suetonius), the connection of Lucilius with the Old Comedy. Thus we see, runs the argument, that the phrase *archaeae comoediae caractere compositum* is not Diomedes's (Suetonius's) own, but Varro's.

<sup>4</sup> But all Roman writers who speak of Lucilius at all definitely see this element in him; see below, pages 134-136. Leo is perpetrating Jahn's error (see above, p. 129) in confusing facts and (his own) theorizing about the facts.

<sup>5</sup> On this contention see P. A. P. A. 40, liv.

development of comedy into relation with political conditions and public circumstances (74-75). Livy depends on Varro, not on Varro's *De Originibus Scenicis*, as Jahn thought, but on some compendious account, standing, perhaps, in the *Antiquitates Divinae* or in the *De Poetis* (76, n. 2). To prove all this let us

(4) compare Livy's account in detail with Aristotle's. We shall thus see that Varro, Livy's source, stands in most intimate relation to the Peripatetic literary view (76-79); the definition of Lucilian satire rests also on this view (79). A priori this conclusion is entirely possible, in view of Varro's place in Roman literary history (79-81).<sup>1</sup>

The rest of the paper (81-84) is taken up with a discussion of a suggestion of Kiessling that Varro is Io. Lydus's ultimate authority for a statement connecting Lucilius with Rhinthon, and does not concern us.

Of this wide array of important matters only a few can be treated here. Further, only broad, general arguments can be considered; details must be avoided.

Leo's opening sentence, "Die römische Komödie kannte kein *ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳθεῖν*", taken literally, is sufficiently disproved by what Leo himself writes, both in this paper and elsewhere,<sup>2</sup> concerning Naevius's freedom of speech. Suppose, however, we grant his contention: what of it? The more he emphasizes the absence of personal invective from Roman comedy,<sup>3</sup> the more he annihilates his own argument (page 73) that such invective is not of the

<sup>1</sup> On this see below, pages 139-144.

<sup>2</sup> In his *Plautinische Forschungen* (1894), 67-68, Leo accepted still the ancient accounts of Naevius's *παρησία* and imprisonment, but refused to believe the story of his recantation in prison (Gell. 3. 3. 15). So Schanz<sup>3</sup>, § 25 b, p. 62 (in his second edition he characterized Leo's scepticism as groundless). One sentence in *Pl. Forsch.* is interesting: "Naevius selbst, dessen Bedeutung nicht zum wenigsten darin liegt, das er der *ἀρχαία κωμῳδία* nachstrebte . . ."; this would seem to involve *ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳθεῖν*. See above, p. 131, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> In seeking to prove this, Leo declares (68) that in more than one place we see the impression made on Plautus by freedom of speech; he cites, without quoting, *Trin.* 1057-1058 (spoken by a slave); *Truc.* 493-496 (soldier); *Per.* 75-76 (parasite); *Cur.* 512-514 (parasite); *Ps.* 296, 570. But *Cur.* 512, *Ps.* 296, 570 have not the remotest connection with Leo's theme; the other passages are innocuous enough: in none was Plautus thinking of satire or anything approaching personal invective. In *Trin.* 1056 the slave merely says: *ego sum insipientior, qui rebus cures publicis potius quam . . . meo tergo tutelam geram*. The kind of thing to which the slave here and the parasite in *Per.* 75 take exception is common enough in Plautus: thus in *Men.* 571-595 Menaech-

essence of Roman (Lucilian) satire, and that the emphasis laid by Horace and others on that element in Lucilius was unnatural, due not to the actual presence of that element in Lucilius, at least in the degree represented by the tradition, but to the importation of that element from Greek comedy into Lucilius by the Roman writer who first worked out, on the basis of Greek models, the whole tradition of Roman comedy-satire (see the analysis of Leo's paper, above, 3, h,  $\beta$ , p. 133). If Lucilius was the first to break the shackles which bound plebeian writer of plays and actor (68), as Leo argues, we cannot wonder that his freedom of speech was at once remarked and passed into the standing tradition concerning his writings. Horace, who knew Lucilius well, far better than any modern scholar has ever known him,<sup>1</sup> is witness to the presence in Lucilius of this element of personal invective: see S. 1. 4. 1-6, 1. 10. 3-15, 2. 1. 62-74: was Horace wholly deceived? Was Persius (1. 114 ff.),<sup>2</sup> was Juvenal (1. 165 ff.) deceived? Quintilian 10. 1. 93, though disagreeing sharply with Horace concerning the *form* of Lucilius's writing, none the less agrees with him concerning the *spirit*, finding in Lucilius (apparently on the basis of personal knowledge) *mira . . . libertas atque inde acerbitas et abundantia salis*. Both Horace (S. 1. 10. 2) and Quintilian (10. 1. 93) show clearly that Lucilius had his ardent admirers and constant readers: we may be sure, therefore, that statements made by either Horace or Quintilian concerning Lucilius would be carefully considered before they were published. That personal invective—*ὀνομαστὶ κωμῶδειν*—was of the essence of Old Comedy at Athens is attested sufficiently by the imposing authority of Aristotle:<sup>3</sup> but had we no word of Aristotle, we should see that

mus I delivers a long tirade against cherished Roman institutions (the clients, the courts), and in 446-461 Peniculus the parasite inveighs against the *contio* and the *comitia* (but no individual is named: in 451 he curses, safely enough, *illum . . . qui primus <hoc> commentus est, contionem habere*).

<sup>1</sup> This is especially true, if Tyrrell, *Latin Poetry, 178-183*, is at all right in his suggestion that in his *Sermones* Horace was trying to modernize Lucilius. See also note 2.

<sup>2</sup> In T. A. P. A. 40. 121-150, Lucilius and Persius, Professor G. C. Fiske argues that for Persius Lucilius is a source second in importance only to Horace. He refers also to Horace's relations to Lucilius: see e.g. 125-126. Both themes he pursued in a paper read before the American Philological Association in December, 1911: see volume 42 of the *Transactions and Proceedings of the Association* (to appear later in 1912).

<sup>3</sup> See Hendrickson 15. 17-18 (after Bernays, *Ergänzung zu Aristoteles Poetik*, Rh. Mus. 8 (1853). 561 ff.).

element for ourselves in Aristophanes, particularly now that we can put Menander and Aristophanes, and not merely Aristophanes and Plautus or Terence, side by side. Leo's judgment of simple facts was warped by his preconceived theories concerning the source of Livy 7. 2.

If, then, Leo himself was mistaken in declaring that the ancient authorities, Greek and Roman, erred in stressing as they do the element of personal invective in Greek comedy and in Roman satire, especially as seen in Lucilius, his argument that the account of Roman comedy seen in Horace and Livy is based, not on fact, but on a perverted Aristotelian-Peripatetic-Alexandrian tendency to overstress the element of personal invective in the Old Comedy loses its weight.

On page 75, bottom, page 76, top, Leo remarks that Livy mentions the pestilence of 365-364 "nach annalistischer Quelle".<sup>1</sup> In note 1 to page 76 he adds: "Fest. 326: scaenicos primum fecisse C.—lium M. Popilium M. f. (Cons. 395)—aediles memoriae prodiderunt historici". If *historici* reported this, the version of the history of comedy which appears in Livy may well antedate Varro, and there will then be no room for the sort of unveracious activity (to use a mild term) ascribed by Leo and Hendrickson (15) to Varro (or Accius: Hendrickson 19). What then becomes of their elaborate structure? Further, part of the statements of Livy and Valerius Maximus is strongly confirmed by Tertullian *De Spectaculis* 5.<sup>2</sup> There Tertullian, who is trying to show that spectacles are idolatrous, says: *De originibus quidem, ut secretioribus et ignotis penes plures nostrorum, altius nec aliunde investigandum fuit quam de instrumentis ethnicalium litterarum. Exstant auctores multi qui super ista re commentarios ediderunt. Ab his ludorum origo sic traditur. Lydos ex Asia transvenas in Etruria consedissee Timaeus refert, duce Tyrrheno, qui fratri suo cesserat regni contentione. Igitur in Etruria inter ceteros ritus superstitionum suarum spectacula<sup>3</sup> quoque religionis nomine instituunt. Inde Romani arcessitos artifices<sup>4</sup> mutuantur, tempus, enuntia-*

<sup>1</sup> See also Leo, 39. 73 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The passage well illustrates the (simple but often neglected) difference between stating facts and theorizing about them, to which attention was called above, pages 127, 129.

<sup>3</sup> Clearly theatrical performances. Compare *ludi*, *ludos* in the next two sentences; that word, without adjective, constantly = *ludi scaenici*.

<sup>4</sup> This reinforces my argument in P. A. P. A. 40. liv that the *ludiones ex Etruria acciti*, of Livy 7. 2. 4, were professionals.

tionem, ut ludi a Lydis vocarentur. Sed etsi Varro ludos a ludo, id est a lusu, interpretatur . . . Here Tertullian indicates as plainly as one can that Varro was not his authority; he cites Varro for a view in contrast to the one he accepts himself.<sup>1</sup>

On page 70 Leo contends that Festus 314 (Müller) is identical with our Diomedes passage. Festus says: *Satura et cibi genus . . . et lex . . . . T. Annius Luscus in ea quam dixit adversus Ti. Gracchum . . . et C. Laelius in ea quam pro se dixit dein postero die quasi per saturam sententiis exquisitis in deditionem accipitur*. It is fair enough to see, with Leo, a lacuna before *dein* . . . *accipitur*, since these words come in fact from Sallust Iug. 29. But I cannot follow Leo when he holds that the order of development in Festus is identical with that of Diomedes, and that, therefore, the two passages have the same source. The lacuna, he suggests, may well have contained the citation from Lucilius which we have in Diomedes; it is certain, he continues, that Lucilius's name stood "auch in der Quelle". One sees well here the magic power of a (purely subjective) *möglich* and *sicher*; they preclude all need of proof.

I note myself that in Festus there is no reference to the Greek etymology of *satura*, and no reference to the *satura lanx*. In Diomedes again, where there is no suspicion of a lacuna, there is no citation from T. Annius or from Laelius. As the text of Festus and Diomedes now stands we have the following exhibit:

<i>Festus.</i>	<i>Diomedes.</i>
.....	Two classes of <i>satura</i> : the Lucilian-Horatian-Persian type, the Ennian-Pacuvian type.
.....	<i>satura</i> =σάτυροι.
.....	<i>satura lanx</i> : two citations from the <i>Georgics</i> .
<i>satura farcimen</i> : no citation from Varro.	<i>satura farcimen</i> : Varro cited without name of work; Varro cited, from <i>Quaestiones Plautinae</i> .
<i>satura lex</i> : T. Annius Luscus and C. Laelius cited by name; a lacuna, unindicated, closed by a citation from Sallust, whose name does not appear.	<i>satura lex</i> : Lucilius cited by name; Sallust cited by name; no hint of a lacuna.

<sup>1</sup> Reifferscheid, *Suetonii Reliquiae*, 322-335, regarded Suetonius as Tertullian's main (sole?) authority and included in his fragments of Suetonius nine passages from Tertullian *De Spectaculis* 3-12. But this is to disregard Tertullian's *multi* and *ab his* in Chapter 5.

The wide differences between the two accounts did not trouble Leo. Ejecting from the text of Diomedes the names of Horace and Persius (69: see above, p. 133, n. 1) and the citations from the *Georgics*, and injecting into the Festus passage the Lucilius quotation actually found in Diomedes, he holds that the two passages are identical and come from the same source. But even this wrong and arbitrary procedure does not prove his point.

More than once the sceptics have laid stress on the fact that in Festus's (Verrius Flaccus's) discussion of *satura* nothing is said of a dramatic *satura*; hence, they infer, Verrius Flaccus knew nothing of such a dramatic *satura*; hence, they inferred again, there was no such dramatic *satura*.<sup>1</sup> Even assuming that their procedure, given their premise, is logical, the table drawn up above nullifies all such arguments; a fairer inference, surely, would be that neither Verrius Flaccus nor Festus nor Diomedes was giving all that was to be found about the *satura* by him who was willing to make an exhaustive search; hence, even granting that Festus's brief notice reproduces all that Verrius said about *satura* (a hypothesis negatived by the very nature of epitomes), we have here no evidence that there was not a dramatic *satura* available to Verrius's inquiries, had he cared to make them.

Leo argues (71) that the 'medley' etymologies for *satura* given by Diomedes apply only to the *satura* of Ennius, not to Lucilius or his successors; it was only in his first period that Lucilius employed a variety of meters. Hence, he concludes, Diomedes's account here goes back to an early time, to some one who could keep the historical standpoint with respect to *satura* (Varro). This seems feeble. Why restrict *satura* to form, as Leo does in dragging in the meters of Lucilius? All Roman satirical writing is more or less of a medley; cf. Nettleship, *Satura* (Lectures and Essays, Second Series, 37, 39); Sellar, Roman poets of the Republic, 233-234 (on the discursiveness of Lucilius). Leo overlooks too the discursiveness of Juvenal, the medley character of his Satires, vouched for by Juvenal himself in 1. 81-85, verses which close with the famous words *nostri farrago libelli*.<sup>2</sup>

I pass over Leo's effort to show that Livy's account is identical with Aristotle's, because his main arguments are repeated and

<sup>1</sup> See e. g. Marx, *Lucilius* I. IX ff. (cf. my review of this book, A. J. P. XXIX 469); Elmore, P. A. P. A. 30.67. See now Webb, *Cl. Phil.* 7. 186, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> See Butler, *Post-Augustan Poetry*, 295, 318-319; Friedländer, *Juvenal*, 48-52, Wilson, *Juvenal*, xxiii-xxiv.

elaborated in Hendrickson's paper, A. J. P. XV 1-30, to which we must now turn (Hendrickson everywhere makes Leo's paper the foundation of his own). I have space to consider only a portion of the part (10-20) in which he compares Livy with Aristotle, and Livy with Horace. His purpose is to show that the two Roman accounts are one, that they are based on Aristotle, and that *satura* in Livy is merely the designation of a form of drama which Varro<sup>1</sup> invented in order to have in Roman literature a parallel to the Old Comedy of the Greeks.

According to Hendrickson, the most important phase in the development of Greek comedy, as described by Aristotle, was the introduction of the general plot, and the giving up of the *ιαμβική ιδέα*, i. e. personal censure and invective. Here it will be best to quote Hendrickson's exact words (10):

"Epicharmus and Phormis in Sicily had been the first to make this change, but of the Athenians Κράτης πρῶτος ἤρξεν ἀφέμενος τῆς *ιαμβικῆς ιδέας καθόλου ποιεῖν λόγους καὶ μύθους*. With this description of the work of Crates compare the words of Livy (8): *Livius . . . ab saturis ausus est primus argumento fabulam serere*.<sup>2</sup> That there is a relation here is obvious, and also that somehow or other the *saturae* are compared with the iambic *ιδέα*—a phrase which describes the element of personal abuse . . . which characterized

<sup>1</sup> In A. J. P. 19 he makes Accius the inventor. But the identity of the inventor is here immaterial.

<sup>2</sup> Leo 24. 78 had used these considerations, in more dogmatic, less reasoned form. Livy 7. 2. 8-9, which deals with the *canticum* matter (see above, page 129), he condemned severely as an aetiological myth, because Andronicus was not actor, but schoolmaster (the two things are incompatible, he says: I wonder why!) nor were all writers of plays actors then. By *omnes*, then, Livy meant the *vernaculi artifices*; the whole story is an invention on the analogy of the accounts of the Attic tragic and comic poet-actors. "Das mag uns zum Verständniss der Worte führen *ab saturis . . . serere*. Was hat Andronicus mit der 'satura', was überhaupt mit volksmässigen Rudimenten römischen Bühnenspiels zu thun? Er war von griechischer Geburt und Bildung, das Latein hat er erlernt; er übersetzte attische Tragödie und Komödie . . . Seine Einreihung in eine organische Entwicklung, wie sie Livius' Gewährsmann versucht, ist das denkbar grösste litterarhistorische Missverständniss, erklärbar nur durch den Zwang der Schablone, nach der der Gewährsmann gearbeitet hat. Die Worte sagen selbst, woher sie stammen: sie sind eine fast wörtliche Wiedergabe des aristotelischen Κράτης . . . μύθους." There is here only assertion, not proof.

For sufficient commentary on these utterances see above, page 129, and below, pages 140-144.



the old comedy, in distinction from the *μῦθοι* or the *μῦθος διὰ τῶν εἰκότων* of the new comedy. ἡ λαμβικὴ ιδέα serves, therefore, at once to designate and to characterize the old comedy, which Horace describes in the well-known lines at the beginning of the fourth satire of the first book . . . For the same qualities of aggressive personal attack, Lucilius appears in a relation of dependence upon the old comedy in the verses which follow . . . If a relation was thus recognized between Lucilius and the old comedy because of common characteristics, what would be more natural than that a descriptive designation of the old comedy (ἡ λαμβικὴ ιδέα) should be interpreted by the name of the compositions of Lucilius (*saturae*)? Our conclusion therefore is that the term *satura* in Livy's account owes its origin to a transference of the word, in the sharply defined meaning given to it by the peculiarly aggressive quality of the poems of Lucilius, to an assumed Roman parallel of the old Attic comedy . . .".

In so far as there is proof or argument at all in this passage, it lies in the comparison which the reader is requested to make between the sentences *Κράτης . . . μύθους* and *Livius . . . serere*. Professor Hendrickson's mind (so too Leo's) seems to have worked as follows. Disregarding Aristotle's *καθόλου*<sup>1</sup>—a most important word—he concluded that these sentences were identical in the latter part: he took *serere* as = *ποιεῖν*, *argumento* as = *λόγους καὶ μύθους* (the correspondence, at least verbally, of *πρῶτος* and *primus* is obvious): hence he inferred that the sentences were identical elsewhere, and so he interpreted *ab* as parallel to *ἀφίμενος*, and so finally reached the conclusion that *saturis*, the sole remaining element of the Latin sentence, must be identical with *τῆς λαμβικῆς ιδέας*, all that remains of the Greek sentence. Here again the logical faculties of our sceptics seem defective. Granted that the sentences are identical in the latter part, the inference that they are identical elsewhere is a non-sequitur. But they are not identical in the latter part: Aristotle is speaking of a *specific kind of plot*, Livy is speaking of *plot in general*; Livius Andronicus brought true plot of any sort for the first time into the Latin drama. Further, Professor Hendrickson's contention proves too much. Granted the complete identity of the two

<sup>1</sup> On page 10, n. 3, Professor Hendrickson tries, unsuccessfully, I think, to show that elsewhere *argumentum* is a "very accurate rendering of *καθόλου* . . . μύθους". Granted, however, that he succeeded: the meaning of *argumento* in Livy is clear from the context.

sentences, it follows that the *saturae* had a plot, nay more, had individualizing, lampooning plot. But Livy clearly indicates that the *saturae* had no plot;<sup>1</sup> he mentions the word plot (*argumentum*) first in connection with Andronicus (§ 8). No word said of the *saturae* in § 7 suggests plot. Livy as clearly refrains from using any words concerning the *saturae* and other forms of the early Roman drama which can by any stretch of interpretation be regarded as setting forth the ideas contained in the phrase ἡ λαμβικὴ ἰδέα.<sup>2</sup> See P. A. P. A. 40, liv. To my eyes and mind, then, the sentences under consideration are at one at just a single point, in the words *πρῶτος* and *primus*. But even that identity is a purely verbal one; Crates and Andronicus were each pioneers, yes, but in quite different spheres.

I turn now to consider the use which Professor Hendrickson makes of Horace S. 1. 4. 1-6 in the passage quoted above from him (p. 140). To do this rightly it will be necessary to discuss the relation of Serm. 1. 4, 1. 10, and 2. 1 to one another. I accept the view that 1. 4 is Horace's *apologia pro scriptis suis*.<sup>3</sup> In the absence

<sup>1</sup> I am glad to find that Leo 39. 64 made this point clearly and well against Hendrickson (and, it may be said, against himself, 24). See also Webb, Cl. Phil. 7. 185.

<sup>2</sup> The only expressions in Livy at all pertinent here are *iocularia fundentes*, in § 5, said of the Fescennines, and *postquam lege hac fabularum ab risu ac soluto ioco res avocabatur* (§ 11) . . . There is nothing in these words suggestive of personal invective. If proof is needed, we may note that even *Fescennina licentia*, *opprobria rustica*, and *libertas* in Hor. Epp. 2. 1. 145, 146, 147 have no suggestion of the λαμβικὴ ἰδέα, as Horace clearly shows by 147-148, *libertas . . . lusit amabiliter, donec iam saevus apertam in rabiem coepit verti* . . . Livy's *iocularia* and *risus ac solutus iocus* are far removed from Horace's *saevus iocus*. Webb, Cl. Phil. 7. 188, n. 1, is sadly confused.

<sup>3</sup> I have carefully studied Professor Hendrickson's paper, Horace, Serm. 1. 4: A Protest and a Programme, A. J. P. XXI 121-143, but am not thereby induced to abandon the view that S. 1. 4 was written by Horace in self-defence. The latter part of 1. 4 does indeed contain a programme, but that programme is part of the self-defence. Professor Hendrickson had no warranty for saying that S. 1. 2 was the only piece in Lucilian vein Horace had ever written (see page 123: 122, top, is less venturesome). Nor had he authority for asserting that 1. 3 preceded in time 1. 4, and that, therefore, before he wrote 1. 4, Horace had already abandoned the Lucilian vein. I agree rather with Professor Morris that 1. 3 is late, that in "style and thought" it is "one of the mature satires of the First Book". The stage in the friendship of Horace with Maecenas represented by 1. 3 points the same way. Not only at the time of 1. 4, but later, in the days of 2. 1. 1, 13 ff., Horace had to meet criticism of his Sermones. He remembered those days of criticism for many years; see

of external evidence we must examine the poem itself. That his *Sermones* were much criticized is apparent from S. 1. 10. 1 ff., 2. 1. 1 ff., and Epp. 1. 4. 1 (see Wickham ad loc.). The criticisms of Horace had touched (a) the form, (b) the spirit of his *Sermones*. The criticism of the form of his writings he meets smilingly, by a confession of guilt (39-63). The other charge—far more serious—distresses him; to this he devotes much more than half the *Sermo*: with it he begins (1-7), to it he returns (64-143). In verses 1-7 he says in effect, "If you think that aught is wrong with the spirit of my *Sermones*, please note that I got that spirit from Lucilius, and that he in turn owed it to the Old Attic Comedy. What you criticize, then, has the best of lineages, the best of warranties". He begins, then, with spirit, hiding behind the popularity of Lucilius.<sup>1</sup> From matters of spirit he drifts easily and naturally, through his criticism of the carelessness of Lucilius, to the consideration of matters of form (8-63); from this he brings himself back sharply, in 64, to matters of spirit. Here, having felt his way to reasonably firm ground, having won some measure of tolerance, he might hope, by his plea of guilty to the charge that his *Sermones* are not poetry, he proceeds to show that after all the spirit of his *Sermones* is not particularly objectionable. In this piece, then, Horace is a lawyer, with himself as client; with all a lawyer's cleverness he makes out the best possible case for himself.<sup>2</sup> In a word, S. 1. 4 is throughout a piece of special pleading.<sup>3</sup>

---

Epp. 1. 4. 1, with Wickham's note, and Epp. 2. 2. 60, where *Bionis sermonibus* is said of the *Sermones* (see Wickham again). Why does Horace in 1. 4. 94, in a piece which can so easily be interpreted as an apologia, cite a verse from 1. 2, a Lucilian satire? Wickham's discussion of S. 2. 1. 34 ff. is pertinent: "I grant you", says Horace, "that I am like Lucilius, but I am also different. Like him, I strike hard on occasion (44-46), but only in self-defence". Pertinent, too, is the name *iambi* used of the Epodes: see Epp. 1. 19. 23 (interpreted in the light of A. P. 79), Epod. 14. 7, Carm. 1. 16, 1-3, 24. On the name *iambi* see Hendrickson, A. J. P. XV 10, 11, 25, 27. For the kinship of the Epodes to the *Sermones*, in time and theme, see Wickham's general Introduction to the Epodes, vol. 1, 326.

<sup>1</sup> For that popularity see above, p. 135.

<sup>2</sup> He argues much as Cicero often does, for he says, in effect: (a) Assuming, for the sake of argument, that your criticism of the spirit of my *Sermones* is well taken, what of it? I am merely doing what Lucilius did, etc.; besides, I do not get what I write before the general public. (b) What you say is not so; I am not so very censorious after all.

<sup>3</sup> For one bit of disingenuousness see 70-76. Even on Mr. Hendrickson's theory of S. 1. 4 Horace is here not quite candid: if he is not to recite or to publish, what difference does it make what his theory of satirical writing is?

In S. 1. 10 the situation is different. Some time has elapsed since the publication of 1. 4; in that time Horace's position, social and literary, has become far more secure, and he is at liberty to set forth his real convictions. In 1. 4 he begins by praising the spirit of Lucilius; here he clearly condemns it (1-15). Lucilius always kept his bow taut; he did not know how to employ *ridiculum* as well as the *acre* and the *triste*.<sup>1</sup>

If, now, there is anywhere a conflict in the views expressed by these two Sermones, Horace's true beliefs are likely to appear in 1. 10 rather than in 1. 4. 1. 10 is the later utterance, in the days of his more assured position, when he may speak more unreservedly; in it he begins by criticizing (not praising) the spirit of Lucilius, passing on in 50-63 ff. to a criticism of his form severer even than that in 1. 4. 8 ff. Let us mark now 1. 10. 64-69:

Fuerit Lucilius, inquam,  
comis et urbanus, fuerit limatior idem  
quam rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor,  
quamque poetarum seniorum turba: sed ille,  
si foret hoc nostrum fato dilatus in aevum,  
detereret sibi multa, etc.

Who is the *auctor* of 66? To my mind only one answer has ever been possible:<sup>2</sup> the *auctor* is Lucilius. Seeing that nowhere else in any of his writings does Horace connect the name of Ennius with his Sermones and the department they represent, Ennius cannot be meant here. All through 1. 4 and 2. 1 it is Lucilius, not Ennius, that Horace has in mind; in 1. 10 also, up to 64, Lucilius had been the literary forbear of whom Horace has been

<sup>1</sup> Here I agree, to some extent, with Professor Hendrickson (see his paper, Horace and Lucilius: a Study of Horace S. 1. 10, published in Studies in Honour of B. L. Gildersleeve, 151-168), especially in his interpretation of *sermone tristi*, 11: see pp. 152-153.

<sup>2</sup> I do not think it necessary to enumerate those who have held that *auctor* here means Ennius. They thought of Ennius to get rid of the conflict between 1. 4. 1-6 and 1. 10. 66. Professor Morris, in his note on 66, thinks that neither Ennius nor Lucilius is meant; he translates "I grant, therefore, that he had a certain degree of polish, more, of course than a writer composing some entirely new (rude) kind of poetry, some poetry untouched by the Greeks, would have had . . .". Part of this is negated by the text above. Further, Hendrickson (Gildersleeve Studies, 139) has clearly shown that Horace did *not* mean, in 64 ff., to grant polish, etc., to Lucilius.

speaking. Further convincing evidence of the meaning of *auctor* appears in 46-51:

hoc erat experto frustra Varrone Atacino  
 atque quibusdam aliis melius quod scribere possem,  
 inventore minor; neque ego illi detrahere ausim  
 haerentem capiti cum multa laude coronam.  
 At dixi fluere hunc lutulentum, saepe ferentem  
 plura quidem tollenda relinquendis.

With *inventore*, 48, we must supply *eius* or *eius rei*, referring back to *hoc* (satire), 46. *inventore* is picked up by *illi*, 48, and that in turn by *hunc* of 50. Fortunately, the identity of *hunc* in 50 is made absolutely clear by the fact that 50-51 reproduce pretty exactly 1. 4. 11, plainly used of Lucilius.

The *auctor*, then, of 66 is Lucilius, and Lucilius is described in S. 1. 10 as writer of a form of poetry untouched by the Greeks; in 1. 4. 6 we have *Hinc* (i. e. from the writers of the Old Attic Comedy) *omnis pendet Lucilius*. Manifestly S. 1. 4 and S. 1. 10 are not in harmony with each other. In S. 1. 10 Horace has anticipated Quintilian's famous dictum (10. 1. 93) *Satura quidem tota nostra est*. If, as is argued above, 1. 10 gives us Horace's real views, Horace does not belong with those ancient authors who connect Lucilius with the Old Attic Comedy, and an important prop is removed from the theories of Leo and Hendrickson.<sup>1</sup>

Professor Hendrickson realizes that his readers will hesitate to identify the *saturae* of Livy with the Old Comedy, to see in them "an assumed stage of Roman dramatic development corresponding to the old comedy" (12). Accordingly, to reinforce his view, he asks what Livy really says about the *saturae*. That, he an-

<sup>1</sup> If my argument is sound, it has an important bearing on Professor Hendrickson's paper, *Satura—The Genesis of a Literary Form*, Cl. Phil. 6. Because Horace, in speaking of his own writings in S. 1. 4 and 1. 10, uses very vague and general expressions, Professor Hendrickson concluded that the word *Satura* was not yet in use as a designation of a form of literature. My argument above implies that Horace had the best of reasons for avoiding the term *Satura* as a designation of his *Sermones*. The same argument shows why he could without hesitation employ in Book 2—which belongs to a later day, when his position was secure—the term *Satura* of his own writings. Further, if Professor Hendrickson was right in seeing in S. 1. 4 (see page 141, n. 3) a protest by Horace against the current conception of satirical writing, he supplies himself a good reason for Horace's avoidance of the term throughout his first book of *Sermones*. See also Webb, Cl. Phil. 7. 178-181, and above, p. 130, n. 5.

swers, they had (a) some pretensions to form, (b) they were performed by professionals. (b) is right. In § 7 Livy does clearly describe the *saturae* as an advance in form over the Fescennines. In the negative side of his description he says they were *non, sicut ante, Fescennino versu similem incompositum . . . ac rudem*; in the positive part of his description, he emphasizes, as the one new element, a more developed musical form.<sup>1</sup> There is no longer absolute 'Planlosigkeit' in matter; there is a better musical form. But I cannot follow Professor Hendrickson when he declares that the fact that the *saturae* were performed by professionals (*vernaculi artifices*, §§ 6-7) in itself shows "a stage of thoroughly-developed dramatic form". Professionalism and lack of form exist side by side even today, all too often. In the first stage described by Livy—the Tuscan dancer stage—we have professionals, but nothing that either the ancients or ourselves would really call dramatic form. Nor can I agree with Professor Hendrickson that the words *ab risu ac soluto ioco*, § 11, refer back to the *saturae* alone and so serve to characterize them alone further, with a hint, he means, of the *λαμβικὴ ἰδέα*. They refer, I am sure, to the Fescennines as well; Livy is looking back over the whole development he has described. But even if the words are restricted to the *saturae*, they do not help Mr. Hendrickson; there is in them no hint of the *λαμβικὴ ἰδέα*. See above, page 141.

One other suggestion made by Professor Hendrickson in this connection needs but to be stated to be disregarded. "By *impletas modis*", he says (13), "may well be suggested something of the manifold musical and metrical form of the parabasis". In a footnote he compares Platonius: ἡ δὲ παράβασις ἐπληροῦτο ὑπὸ μελῳδρίου καὶ κομματίου καὶ στροφῆς καὶ ἀντιστροφῶν κτλ.

It is difficult enough to see how Mr. Hendrickson could ever have believed that any Roman critic—a Varro or an Accius—could soberly have imagined or have expected any one else to imagine that the *saturae* of Livy were an analogue to the Old Attic Comedy, the marvellous productions of Aristophanes. It is an even severer strain on credulity to suggest that so vague a phrase as *impletae modis* would suggest what Platonius says. Once again Mr. Hendrickson's wonderful verbal memory has played him false: the words of Livy and Platonius agree at just one point: *impletae* and ἐπληροῦτο both suggest the idea of fullness.

<sup>1</sup> See Webb, Cl. Phil. 7. 183-184.

The limits of space allotted to this paper are nearly exhausted. I must, therefore, draw these remarks to a close. I have examined some of the more important arguments of the sceptics, and have, I think, shown how weak they are, and how poor has been the foundation on which their elaborate structures have been reared. There has been no room to consider a host of details involved in the comparison of Horace and Livy with each other, and of both with Aristotle. I feel sure that I can show that the same lack of logic, the same straining to make a point, the same bending of simple passages to suit a preconceived theory marks the detailed discussion of individual paragraphs and verses which we have noted in our discussion above of the broad general doctrines on which the sceptics sought to base their case. I can prove, I feel sure, that the article by which Professor Hendrickson, in A. J. P. XIX, claims to differentiate the views of Accius concerning the chronology of early Latin literature from those of Varro is without basis of any sort in fact, and that therefore this paper too is of no value, so far, at least, as its main contention is concerned.

I shall conclude the present paper with a brief discussion of Schanz's views of the dramatic *satura*. In his second edition he had been but little influenced by the views of the sceptics. In his third edition (1907), in § 9, pages 21-22, he adopts a curious compromise. He believes firmly in early native forms of the drama among the Romans. At Rome, as elsewhere, he says, the beginnings of the drama are connected with "die Festfreude". In Horace Epp. 2. 1. 139 ff. we get, he maintains, a definite name "für ein dramatisches element", i. e. *Fescennina licentia*. "Dass diese 'fescenninische Angelassenheit' uns den Anfang des italischen Dramas darstellt, kann nicht bezweifelt werden; auch die gelehrte Forschung des Altertums verkannte das nicht wie ein ätiologischer Bericht bei Livius zeigt". He then takes up Livy's narrative, which, he says, raises doubts. It is impossible that song and dance "erst später hinzukamen". . . "Auch der Name *satura* ist höchst wahrscheinlich von dem Forscher, dem Livius seinen Bericht verdankt, zur Bezeichnung des improvisierten Spiels, das keinen Namen hatte, gestempelt worden". It should be remarked at once that Livy does not at all represent the *saturae* as improvisations: see § 7, and above, page 145.

On page 22, going into details, he declares that Livy's narrative shows plainly that "uns eine konstruierte Geschichte des röm-

ischen Dramas vorliegt", which seeks to set up a connection (Zusammenhang) that did not in fact exist. So quite wrongly, Livius Andronicus, who translated Greek comedies into Latin, is described as the "Fortsetzer einer volksmässigen Posse". I do not believe that Livy so pictures the rôle played by Livius Andronicus. Unfortunately the words *ab saturis* (§ 8) used of Andronicus are none too clear, but there is nothing in Livy's words to forbid the interpretation that Andronicus turned his back on the *saturae*, and essayed something quite different.<sup>1</sup> Livy does not, indeed, call Livius Andronicus a Greek; nor does every other Latin writer in referring to Livius Andronicus think it necessary to call him a Greek;<sup>2</sup> his Greek origin was perfectly well known, being perpetually brought to mind by his very name.

Let us return to Schanz. "Gewiss hat es in Rom vor Einführung der kunstmässigen griechischen Komödie durch Livius Andronicus eine volksmässige Posse gegeben, die wahrscheinlich als eine Fortsetzung der Fescenninen anzusehen ist. Allein diese volksmässige Posse dürfte kaum einen Namen gehabt haben". Why? one may ask. But, continues Schanz, the scholar who put together ("konstruierte") Livy's narrative wanted to give this "Volksmässige Posse" a name. He found the development from the popular pre-Andronican drama to Andronicus's play in this, that in the latter "ein Stoff planvoll durchgeführt war, während die volksmässige Posse Planlosigkeit und Durcheinander darbot"; hence, in looking for a name, he thought of the word *satura*, which was in ordinary use "um die mannigfachen Gaben der Opferschale und die heterogenen Bestandteile eines Gesetzes (*satura lanx*, *satura lex*) zu bezeichnen". His last words are: "Ausser unserer Stelle wird an keiner anderen die volksmässige Posse vor Livius *satura* benannt. Es dürfte daher geraten sein, aus der Litteraturgeschichte die dramatische Satura zu verbannen und nur von Fescenninen und volksmässige Posse zu sprechen".

Here is a most extraordinary jumble! Livy's account is held to set forth the essential truth, and yet is described as "konstruierte" by some combinierende Gelehrte! Livy's narrative is

<sup>1</sup> Some one, I think, has inserted *aversus* after *ab saturis*; I cannot, however, give the proper reference.

<sup>2</sup> I cannot follow Leo 39. 69 when he says "Livius schaltet das Griechische aus . . . Es ist möglich dass Livius selber das griechische Element verschleiern wollte".



accepted as true, virtually, in everything save in one detail—the name he gives to the something that lay between the Fescennines and the plays with plot written by Andronicus. How could one who believed—whether he realized it or not—all else in Livy's account balk over so insignificant a detail as the name *satura*? Further, why should one accept without hesitation the phrases *satura lanx*, *satura lex*, nowhere attested in a literary passage,<sup>1</sup> but vouched for only by grammarians and lexicographers, and yet reject the testimony of Livy,<sup>2</sup> a far better and earlier authority, to a mere name? However, all this is a mere *σκιαμαχία*. I am not interested in the names borne by the forms of the early Roman drama; I rejoice that Schanz still believes in the existence of such forms prior to the time of Livius Andronicus.

CHARLES KNAPP.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

<sup>1</sup> See Funck, *Archiv*. 5. 38.

<sup>2</sup> See Webb's ingenious argument, *Cl. Phil.* 7. 182-185.